

REMARKS

Claims 6 and 14 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

Statement of Substance of Interview

A telephonic interview was conducted with Examiner Corrielus on December 14, 2006. During this interview, Applicant's representative requested and received clarification of the issued raised by the Examiner's Advisory Action of December 6, 2006. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that he agreed that the paragraph of the specification beginning on page 19, line 29 supports the claim language describing the allocation of signals to the reception processing blocks based on service type. The Examiner asserted that there is not support in the specification for the claim limitation of claim 6: "wherein said decoder reads out received signals having a high priority based on the service type of the received signals successively from said memories so as to carry out decoding processing" (see also claim 14).

The Examiner also agreed that if Applicant provides a copy of the PTO-stamped filing receipt of the IDS filed on January 13, 2005, as well as a copy of the IDS, the Examiner will consider the references listed therein and will return a signed and initialed copy of the PTO/SB/08 form.

Addressing Issues Raised in Advisory Action

The Examiner raises three issues in the Advisory Action of December 6, 2006.

First, the Examiner maintains that based on the specification, two RAKE combiners are necessary for each reception block. With respect to this issue, Applicant amends claims 6 and 14, as shown. claim 6 currently recites, in part: "the plurality of memories, wherein each memory is

connected between said decoder and a first RAKE combiner and a second RAKE combiner in each of the plurality of reception processing blocks”. Claim 14 currently recites, in part: “storing a received signal in one of a plurality of memories, wherein each of the plurality of memories is connected between a decoder and a first RAKE combiner and a second RAKE combiner in each reception processing block”.

Second, the Examiner discusses Applicant’s argument that the allocation of signals to reception processing blocks based on service type is supported in the specification at least at the paragraph beginning on page 19, line 29. As noted above, in the interview with the Examiner on December 14, 2006, the following was clarified: The Examiner agrees with Applicant that the paragraph beginning on page 19, line 29 supports the claim language describing that the allocation of signals to the reception processing blocks based on service type. However, the Examiner asserts that there is not support in the specification for the claim limitation: “wherein said decoder reads out received signals having a high priority based on the service type of the received signals successively from said memories so as to carry out decoding processing” (see also claim 14).

With respect to this point, Applicant submits that this limitation is clearly supported in the specification at least in the paragraph beginning on page 23, line 7.

Third, as noted above, the Examiner has agreed that if Applicant provides a copy of the PTO-stamped filing receipt of the IDS filed on January 13, 2005, as well as a copy of the IDS, the Examiner will consider the references listed therein and will return a signed and initialed

copy of the PTO/SB/08 form. These documents are filed herewith for the convenience of the Examiner.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 6 and 14 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the objections and rejections of the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Laura Moskowitz
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 22, 2006